

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action issued on March 25, 2008, claims 1-14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Varon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,404 to Ladwig. Claims 10-14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ladwig in view of Varon. Claims 1 – 14, 17 and 18 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 14 were amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 1-14 do not fail to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §1 12, first paragraph. The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to now recite "obtaining a first plurality of instructions from the first natural language message." Support for this newly recited limitation is found on page 10, lines 18-26, which discloses that an OPORD (i.e., an order) is cycled through and fragmentary orders are "pulled out." The Applicant believes that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to 1-14, is not indefinite because it fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim what the applicant regards as the invention as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Applicant believes that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,420,993 to Varon. Varon discloses a technique for predicting conflict between

maneuvering and non-maneuvering aircrafts. The system receives input including flight data plans designating a route and target signal corresponding to a signal transmitted from, or reflected off of, an aircraft. The system updates and maintains target signals to monitor the locations and speed of aircrafts and generates alerts to indicate that one or more targets are physically closer than allowed using the information received. The system uses the input flight data plans to "designate routes" or "compute a composite flight path" for the aircrafts and predicts violations of separation standards based on a comparison of the "designated routes" or "composite flight path." See Varon col. 4, lines 23-30 and col. 5, lines 19-3 1.

In contrast, the present invention predict whether an alert should be issued because of conflicting natural language instructions. As now claims by claim 1, the present invention

Response to Office Action issued March 25, 2008

obtaining a first plurality of messages from the first natural language message, converting each of the messages in the first plurality of messages and second natural language messages from a natural language format to a spatial temporal format including an event, a type of event, and a time of event, wherein the conversion generates restructured messages that are combined. Varon fails to disclose that any instructions are obtained from a flight plan and converted as now claimed. There is also no disclosure in Varon of comparing any portion of the data flight plans for the respective aircrafts. There is only disclosure that "a composite flight plan is computed and that violations of separation standards are predicted." See Varon col. 5, lines 19-31. Varon fails to teach or suggest the above-identified limitations. Accordingly, claim 1 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon.

Claims 2-8 and 17 depend from claim 1 and thus are not unpatentable over Varon for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 9 is not unpatentable over Varon in view of Ladwig. Ladwig does not cure the deficiencies of Varon. Ladwig merely discloses that an event stream can be transformed. There is no disclosure of how the stream is transformed nor the information included in a transformed event stream. There is also no disclosure of performing any kind of combination of transformed event streams. The combination of Varon and Ladwig fails to teach or suggest the above-identified limitations of claim 1 as well as the identified limitations in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 of the present invention is not unpatentable over Varon in view of Ladwig.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to 10 is not unpatentable over Ladwig in view Varon for the same reasons discussed above with respect to

**Application No.: 09/912,918**

Response to Office Action issued March 25, 2008

claims 1 and 9 above.


Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5219-009-US01)

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Chadwick A. Jackson  
Reg. No. 46,495

Date: August 11, 2008

Hanify & King, Professional Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Department  
1875 K St, N.W.  
Suite 707  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Direct: (202) 403-2102  
Fax: (202) 429-4380